

Date: Wed, 4 Aug 93 04:30:13 PDT  
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>  
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu  
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu  
Precedence: Bulk  
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #283  
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest                      Wed, 4 Aug 93                      Volume 93 : Issue 283

Today's Topics:

ARRL and it's members  
ARRL Internet connection  
Code vs. No Code  
Real CBers  
Towns and towers (2 msgs)

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>  
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>  
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available  
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text  
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official  
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

-----

Date: 3 Aug 93 22:26:40 GMT  
From: psinnntp!arrl.org@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: ARRL and it's members  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In rec.radio.amateur.policy, n9ljx@en.ecn.purdue.edu (Scott A Stambaugh) writes:

>In article <930725.130411.9t0.rusnews.w165w@garlic.sbs.com> system@garlic.sbs.com  
(Tony Pelliccio) writes:

>>...come time for him to be reelected, I'd like to see his butt get tossed.

> the only sure-fire way of doing this is by being involved enough to vote him  
> out. Maybe run against him, or at least help in a campaign for his  
> opposition. B&Ming on usenet is not likely to have the desired results!

Shame on you, Scott! If you let that secret out, hundreds of people will  
cancel the accounts they set up just for that purpose--and half of the hams on

packet will throw away their TNCs if they find out that the same thing is true of packet!

CUL es 73 de BB

```

*****
Brian Battles, WS10      I Tel      203-666-1541, ext 222 I  "Radio amateurs
QST Features Editor     I Fax      203-665-7531          I    do it with
ARRL HQ                 I Internet bbattles@arrl.org      I  great frequency"
Newington, CT USA      I Amprnet  ws1o@ws1o.ampr.org      I
*****

```

-----  
Date: 3 Aug 93 21:03:49 GMT  
From: psinntp!arrl.org@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: ARRL Internet connection  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In rec.radio.amateur.misc, david@bu.edu (David Gagnon) writes:  
>I've recently tried to reply to a post from someone at arrl.org and ended  
>up getting the mail back as undeliverable. Using nslookup, the domain  
>arrl.org doesn't appear to exist. Should I be routing this mail through  
>some other site? Any help would be appreciated.

Say, Doc...

Makes me nervous when an MD 6ells me I don't exist--kinda like seeing my name in the obituaries column! I imagine one of our networking wizards, like Jon Bloom, KE3Z, can supply you with a helpful hint. All I know is that we're hooked in via PSInet at this end.

GL, OM!

CUL es 73 de BB

----- UNREGISTERED EVALUATION LIFE, EXPIRES AFTER MIDNIGHT -----  
CUL es 73 de BB

```

*****
Brian Battles, WS10      I Tel      203-666-1541, ext 222 I  "Radio amateurs
QST Features Editor     I Fax      203-665-7531          I    do it with
ARRL HQ                 I Internet bbattles@arrl.org      I  great frequency"
Newington, CT USA      I Amprnet  ws1o@ws1o.ampr.org      I
*****

```

Date: Tue, 03 Aug 1993 17:50:00 GMT  
From: nwnexus!ole!ssc!markz@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: Code vs. No Code  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

an28477@anon.penet.fi wrote:

: I really everyone would get a life and get off this subject and realize  
: that we are all amateur radio operators who have something to give. If we  
: keep breaking up into little groups, then this hobby is not long for this  
: country.

We're all sorry that this so offends your sensibilities that you have to  
hide behind some computer in Finland, but the reason rec.radio.amateur.policy  
exists is to siphon off the code/nocode flame wars from r.r.a.misc.

It seems to be working. This is what this newsgroup is for.

It's a subject that won't go away, so now it has it's place.

Mark Zenier markz@ssc.wa.com markz@ssc.com

-----  
Date: Tue, 3 Aug 1993 21:47:55 GMT  
From: pa.dec.com!nntpd2.cxo.dec.com!nuts2u.enet.dec.com!little@decwrl.dec.com  
Subject: Real CBers  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

system@garlic.sbs.com (Tony Pelliccio) writes:

>The problem with this is that you get people who came in under the  
>no-code license, then scream because they want HF access without any  
>additional effort. Hence, clueless. :)

You and the Rev keep promoting this red herring. Please provide some  
evidence of this claim. Where are the news postings that support your  
claim or QST letters or articles or any other tangible evidence other than  
your over active imagination? Or is this solely a problem in Rhode Island?

73,  
Todd  
N9MWB

-----  
Date: 3 Aug 93 18:57:16 GMT  
From: microsoft!wingnut!laurahal@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: Towns and towers

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In preparation for moving to a new place I've been doing some homework on the bylaws in some of Vancouver's suburbs regarding antennas and such. We don't have anything analogous to PRB-1 in Canada, except for some nasty jurisdictional lawsuits between local governments and the Federal Government, who think they have full jurisdiction over things like antenna towers.

Attitudes in Greater Vancouver range from "Absolutely no towers" to "Whatever you can afford".

Some specifics, for areas I'm interested in:

Burnaby: whatever you like, as long as the neighbors don't object

City of North Vancouver: Ditto. Don't block the view.

District of North Vancouver: 50 feet in residential areas. Since most of the district is at least 700 feet above sea level with a clear view south down Boundary Bay/Puget Sound, this isn't much of a restriction.

In the city of Vancouver, where I currently live, the across-the-board restriction is 12 feet above the roofline.

My idea of an antenna is a G5RV or equivalent strung between a couple of trees, plus a 2m/440 vertical, so I should be fine...

73 from Vancouver,  
laura VE7LDH

-----  
Date: Tue, 3 Aug 1993 23:25:44 +0000  
From: news!demon!llondel.demon.co.uk!dave@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: Towns and towers  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Aug03.185716.19311@microsoft.com> laurahal@microsoft.com (Laura Halliday) writes:

>  
> Burnaby: whatever you like, as long as the neighbors don't object  
>  
Isn't this true in all cases? Any restriction is usually because the neighbours \*do\* object, and said objections have been quantified :-)

It would have been fun to see what my local council would have done if I

asked for a 120ft tower. They had enough problem with a 35ft one (eventually granted on appeal).

I find it interesting that in North America a 100-200ft tower is considered 'necessary' for all sorts of things. I know that everything is supposed to be 'bigger' over there (especially in Texas) but in the UK I would reckon the norm is 30-40ft, with 60ft considered high, and 100ft+ rare (although I do know of some). Probably because we have less HF beams - most masts are used for VHF/UHF systems.

Dave

```
*****
* G4WRW @ GB7WRW.#41.GBR.EU AX25      *   You think *you* have problems?   *
* dave@llondel.demon.co.uk Internet *   What do you do if you *are*      *
* g4wrw@g4wrw.ampr.org      Amprnet *   a manically depressed robot??   *
*****
```

-----  
Date: Tue, 3 Aug 1993 19:30:16 GMT  
From: swrinde!menudo.uh.edu!uuneo!sugar!jreese@network.ucsd.edu  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <23bgv2INNdl1@network.ucsd.edu>, <CAztu8.53C@sugar.NeoSoft.COM>,  
<1993Aug3.160139.3978@mnemosyne.cs.du.edu>  
Subject : Re: ARRL and its members

In article <1993Aug3.160139.3978@mnemosyne.cs.du.edu> jmaynard@nyx.cs.du.edu (Jay Maynard) writes:

>Uh, Jim...just what would you like Dave to have said? For that amtter, what  
>COULD he say? Is there anything he could have said that would have changed  
>your mind?

Actually, there's probably nothing he could have SAID to change my mind, but there's much that could be DONE by the ARRL which would change my mind.

As you know, my main objection is their poor handling of repeater coordination and band planning matters. They should either get involved DIRECTLY in the process, or get completely out of it. Their actions to date have done nothing but hinder the local coordination efforts...but that's another thread...

Before the flame-mongers light up, I'll admit that repeater coordination and band planning is only a small part of what the ARRL does, but they've screwed that up so completely that I've lost all interest.

--

Jim Reese, WD5IYT | "Bad times bring out the best in Texans, good times  
jreese@sugar.neosoft.com | bring out the worst." --Molly Ivins

-----  
Date: Tue, 3 Aug 1993 19:22:26 GMT  
From: swrinde!menudo.uh.edu!uuneo!sugar!jreese@network.ucsd.edu  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Aug02.165536.14244@news.mentorg.com>,  
<CB6LKw.FL4@sugar.NeoSoft.COM>, <CB72t1.1oF@sugar.NeoSoft.COM>  
Subject : Re: ARRL and its members

In article <CB72t1.1oF@sugar.NeoSoft.COM> sfarlow@NeoSoft.com (Stephen Farlow) writes:

>I have enjoyed my membership in ARRL. Hams should support it, especially  
>since ARRL has a lot of influence with the FCC. No organization is perfect,  
>but at least we have a lobby.

I think the question here is: On \_whose behalf\_ is the ARRL lobbying? If they presented themselves as representing ONLY their members, that's one thing...but they present themselves as representing ALL amateurs. They don't.

I haven't really disagreed with the ARRL in FCC matters, except their opposition of a petition a few years ago to allow auxiliary operation on all amateur frequencies. My disagreements have mainly been in the area of repeater rules, coordination, and band planning. It's here that I believe the ARRL has done much damage to local frequency coordination efforts.

...but I could go on for HOURS!

--  
Jim Reese, WD5IYT | "Bad times bring out the best in Texans, good times  
jreese@sugar.neosoft.com | bring out the worst." --Molly Ivins

-----  
Date: Tue, 3 Aug 1993 22:48:15 GMT  
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!  
europa.eng.gtefsd.com!darwin.sura.net!newsserver.jvnc.net!newsserver.egr.uri.edu!  
orca!swamik@network.ucsd.edu  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <930728.114323.7q4.rusnews.w165w@garlic.sbs.com>,  
<RFM.93Jul31150433@urth.eng.sun.com>,  
<930801.224403.8o5.rnews.w165w@deathstar.empire.com>wsse  
Subject : Re: Real CBers

In article <RN7F8B1w165w@amanda.jpunix.com> robert@amanda.jpunix.com (robert)  
> writes:

```
|>
|> >
|> >
|> > system@garlic.sbs.com (Tony Pelliccio) writes:
|> >
|> > >
|> > > ... .-- .- -- .. --..-- -.-- -- .. --. .... - -. --- -
|> > >
|> > > .-- .- -. - - --- ... .. . -. . --- -... . .... .. -. -. .
|> > >
|> > > - .... . -. --- -. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .
|> > >
|> > > .-- --- -. - -... . .- -... .-... . - --- .- . .- -... .. - .-.--
|> > >
|> > > --... ----- -... . -. -... .---- -. .- .-.. .-..--
|> > >
|> > > -----
|> > > o o Tony Pelliccio, KD1NR, Control Op 441.750+, ARRL VE
|> >
|> > Once again, Tony, I think you have missed the point. CW is an aural mode,
|> >
|> > Actually us code-frees have less trouble reading this stuff than you coders
|> > seem to, we just use our superior technical knowledge and pipe it through a
|> > shell script. Not that we generally bother reading anything from sbs
|> > anyway...
```

Also, what Tony posted is NOT CW. CW is Continuous wave, on/off keying of a carrier. Tony did not attempt on/off keying of a carrier to generate his article. He simply used the - and . keys. This is Morse code, not CW. WHAT SUPERIOR TECHNICAL KNOWLEDGE?!! Besides, it doesn't take much to write a shell script.

---

Swami Kumaresan  
swamik@orca.ele.uri.edu  
swamik@morio.e-technik.uni-kl.de  
KB1AMB@KA1AZ.RI (Ham Radio BBS)  
kb1amb@kb1amb.ampr.org AMPRNet (Amateur Packet Radio TCP/IP Network)

KB1AMB/AA Advanced Class Amateur Radio Operator  
I Monitor 147.165/.765 Repeater  
& 20 meter band (SSB & CW)

73s

---

Date: 3 Aug 1993 22:58:33 -0400  
From: pravda.sdsc.edu!news.cerf.net!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!noc.near.net!  
news.delphi.com!news.delphi.com!not-for-mail@network.ucsd.edu  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <CAxJt5.B3K@egr.uri.edu>, <23d03v\$quv@usenet.INS.CWRU.Edu>,  
<1993Jul31.114333.16818@anomaly.sbs.com>.com  
Subject : Re: Code/NoCode

Since this is a hot topic with me I figured I'd would throw my two cents  
into the kitty...

BTW, I won't even bother to rebut the code vs no-code issue other than  
to say that most of the public service communicators are of the latter  
variety and I have no reason to believe that our shoes would be filled  
by the former if we weren't here.

>When you get right down to it, what has ARES done in your area that  
>normal emergency services crews can't do better and more efficiently?

Let us not forget that the role of the amateur radio service is to provide  
TRAINED operators to provide communications. Emergency service crews may  
utilize communications, but that certainly doesn't make them communicators  
and is a very inefficient use of their time (and this comes from firsthand  
experience as a firefighter/EMT).

>In this area, ARES is a joke. The section Emergency Coordinator rarely  
>shows up for the statewide ARES net. Nobody has a clue as to what is  
>going on.

This is not an uncommon problem, but it is up to us to fix it. Better to  
be part of the solution than part of the problem.

>I am very good friends with several law enforcement officials, many  
>involved with disaster relief. Their opinion of ham-radio emergency  
>services is all the same: its a waste. In fact, many believe that  
>hams actually create \*more\* work for them, because with a bunch of  
>untrained, i-think-i'm-so-important buffoons running around a  
>disaster site, all they do is at the minimum get in the way of real  
>disaster crews doing their job, and at the maximum end up getting  
>themselves hurt or killed.

Again, in my opinion, this is a TRAINING issue. Ask those friends of yours





References <1993Jul29.122119.9251@ee.surrey.ac.uk>,  
<930730.111225.8M3.rusnews.w165w@garlic.sbs.com>,  
<1993Aug01.161816.153259@locus.com>s.  
Subject : Re: Real Cbers

dana@lando.la.locus.com (Dana H. Myers) writes:

```
>>Two things, this is the United States, not the United Kingdom and
>>secondly, to each his own. Some people are perfectly happy to remain in
>>VHF/UHF and others aren't.
>
> Oh, Tony, what makes the UK different than the US? Why isn't Mike's
> comment valid?
```

It means that each country has its own interpretation of the rules. Thankfully it's been a few hundred years since the last time we were a British colony.

I didn't say his comment wasn't valid, I just said it's two different issues. At least the UK hasn't botched licensing as badly as the FCC has.

```
>>The problem with this is that you get people who came in under the
>>no-code license, then scream because they want HF access without any
>>additional effort. Hence, clueless. :)
```

No, you don't often hear it on the air, but look at the flames you get on Usenet when you state your position about denying no-code operators access to HF bands.

The other problem we have around here is an ineffective club. Our most popular repeater (146.700) has NO interference committee at this time but yet the jammers go on, and on, and on.

Tony

```

      o      o  Tony Pelliccio, KD1NR, Control Op 441.750+, ARRL VE
      \      /  system @ garlic.sbs.com                               Soon W5YI VE
       _ _ _
      (oo) Cow humor. Sort of like the Far Side.
     /  \
    /    \

```

```
/ | {MTV}||      MoooTV - Rockin' Bumpin' and Funkin' into the 90's
* ||{___}||
  ||-----||      (And people thought my last .sig was long, ha!)
  ^^          ^^
```

---

-----  
Date: 3 Aug 93 21:20:39 GMT  
From: ogicse!hp-cv!sdd.hp.com!vixen.cso.uiuc.edu!newsrelay.iastate.edu!  
news.iastate.edu!wjturner@network.ucsd.edu  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <Pine.3.07.9308021206.A22263-9100000@uafhp.uark.edu>,  
<1993Aug2.225832.14836@nntpd2.cxo.dec.com>, <1993Aug3.161600.5873@ke4zv.uucp>  
Subject : Re: Lead the Way! (was Re: code/nocode blah blah blah)

In article <1993Aug3.161600.5873@ke4zv.uucp> gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman)  
writes:

>  
>Now that's a good idea. Anyone who can memorize the \*answers\*, not  
>the letter choice (that should be shuffled with each exam), to 500 or  
>1000 potential questions has undoubtedly earned their license. Something  
>is bound to stick.

I hate to say this, but when I took all my theory tests (haven't taken Extra  
yet, though) the questions were always \*exactly\* the same as in the question  
pool. This includes the order of the answers. I know because I happen to  
have a good memory, and while I wasn't trying to memorize the answers, I did  
look at the question pool (might as well use it if they give it to us) and I'd  
when I took the test I'd invariably remember the answer, and the letter that  
it had in the book, and what do you know, they were always the same!!

Will NORDV

--

Will Turner, NORDV	-----
wjturner@iastate.edu	"Are you going to have any professionalism,
twp77@isuvax.iastate.edu	or am I going to have to beat it into you?"
TURNERW@vaxld.ameslab.gov	-----

-----  
Date: Tue, 3 Aug 1993 17:48:36 GMT  
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!magnus.acs.ohio-  
state.edu!math.ohio-state.edu!cs.utexas.edu!swrinde!menudo.uh.edu!uuneo!sugar!  
sfarlow@network.ucsd.edu  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <CAztu8.53C@sugar.NeoSoft.COM>,  
<1993Aug02.165536.14244@news.mentorg.com>, <CB6LKw.FL4@sugar.NeoSoft.COM>th.ohio  
Subject : Re: ARRL and its members

I have enjoyed my membership in ARRL. Hams should support it, especially since ARRL has a lot of influence with the FCC. No organization is perfect, but at least we have a lobby.

Date: Wed, 4 Aug 1993 07:38:01 GMT  
From: news.Hawaii.Edu!uhunix3.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu!jherman@ames.arpa  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <23d03v\$quv@usenet.INS.CWRU.Edu>,  
<1993Jul31.114333.16818@anomaly.sbs.com>, <23n8kp\$k3c@news.delphi.com>  
Subject : Re: Code/NoCode

In article <23n8kp\$3c@news.delphi.com> chdaley@news.delphi.com  
(CHDALEY@DELPHI.COM) writes:

>BTW, I won't even bother to rebut the code vs no-code issue other than  
>to say that most of the public service communicators are of the latter  
>variety and I have no reason to believe that our shoes would be filled  
>by the former if we weren't here.

```
>  
>* Chuck Daley Internet CHDALEY@delphi.com *  
>* KD4LXQ Compuserve 73457,3114 *
```

Chuck, who do you think was filling your shoes prior to the no-code tech license? Do you believe that ARES and RACES are new creations? Could it be possible that we see only no-code techs filling these positions now because the coded licensees have left VHF in disgust, and now operate only HF? Just a thought.

Jeff, NH6IL (ex-WA60IJ)

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #283  
\*\*\*\*\*